

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 48 through 53 are pending, with Claims 48 and 52 being independent. The independent claims have been amended.

Claims 48 through 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over previously-cited US 2003/0200289 A1 (Kemp, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 48 and 52 variously recite, *inter alia*, that the extended function program includes a first extended module related to a new user interface corresponding to a function provided by the core printer driver, an extended function module for allowing the core printer driver to provide a new function, and a second extended module related to a user interface corresponding to the extended function module, and wherein an existing module is replaced by the first extended module, and the extended function module and the second extended module are added for function extension of the core printer driver (with sending to the client apparatus selected on the displayed screen (upon which the manager can select as claimed), the extended function program for the printer that have not been installed in the client apparatus, in accordance with the updated client management table).

By way of example and not of limitation, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to, e.g., Fig. 6, item 602, user interface A' (which may correspond to the first extended module), function module B (which may correspond to the extended function module), and user interface B (which may correspond to the second extended module) (see, e.g., p. 21, lines 14-26). Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kemp, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 48 and 52.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited document that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/jjr